



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

sensational histories of Alexander's achievements, and possesses a perceptible Ptolemaic flavor. It, accordingly, sought, or affected to seek, a reputation for veracity; but whether this was a genuine ambition, or a literary artifice, Ausfeld might have determined differently, had he lived to finish his work. He might then have trusted less in the good faith of the writer's sources; that is to say, given more weight in them to imaginative literature, to Schwartz's historical romances, or to Reitzenstein's *Aretalogie*, if not to Rohde's oriental folk-tales. He might even have come to feel less confidence about the separate existence and personality of any of the elements perceptible in the third-century A. D. text. As it is, his book is valuable to students of mediaeval and ancient literature in that it makes accessible for the first time a reliable interpretation of a work, which, translated, with adaptations, into Latin, Armenian, Syriac, Persian, Arabic, Ethiopian, Coptic, and practically every language of mediaeval Europe, was once known and popular from Naishapûr to Nabata, from England to little Russia.

W. S. FERGUSON

C. Suetoni Tranquilli de Vita Caesarum Libri VIII. Recensuit
MAXIMILIANUS IHM. Leipzig: Teubner, 1907. Pp. lxxvi +
376. M. 12.

This edition marks an advance over the edition of Roth, which, in spite of its shortcomings, has hitherto furnished the standard text of the author. Ihm has made use of a greater number of MSS than did Roth, has collated them more accurately, and in his text has frequently returned to the readings of the better MSS, discarding the conjectures of earlier editors, a method of procedure which might well have been carried to even greater length than it has been.

Ihm follows Traube in regarding as the archetype of the existing MSS the lost Fuldensis, written probably in rustic capitals, and used by Einhard in the preparation of the life of Charlemagne. This MS was loaned to Lupus Servatus, abbot of Ferrières, or a transcript of it was sent to him about 844, and is the source from which the numerous French MSS of the lives are derived, the Memmianus s. IX, written at Tours, the oldest and best of our MSS, being, perhaps, a direct copy of the transcript. Two other MSS, showing resemblances to the Memmianus but also divergences which make it unlikely that they were copied directly from the same MS as the Memmianus, are the Gudianus s. XI, the value of which is questioned by Ihm who doubts whether its superior readings were derived from the archetype, and the incomplete Vaticanus 1904, s. XI-XII, more accurate than the Gudianus but representing a copy of the transcript of the Fuldensis differing from the Memmianus. From a lost MS closely related to the Vaticanus Ihm derives a class

designated as X, represented in his collations by Laur. 68, 7, Paris. 5801, Laur. 66, 39, Montepess. 117, all of the twelfth century, and the Hulsianus of the fourteenth century. Another and inferior class, descended in a different line from the copy of Servatus, is designated as Y, and from its numerous representatives Ihm has selected three MSS of the twelfth century, Paris. 6116, Paris. 5802, and Regius 15 C III of the British Museum. In addition to these sources the editor has drawn on the excerpts of Heiric of Auxerre of the ninth century and those of the Notre Dame MS of the thirteenth century. The late MSS are disregarded as representative of the archetype, though not infrequently readings from them are adopted in the text as happy conjectures of fifteenth-century scholars.

The usefulness of the apparatus criticus is impaired by the necessity of consulting both apparatus and introduction for the readings even of the Memmianus, owing to the fact that the editor, to save space and repetition, has treated a number of general questions, including orthography, in the introduction.

The editor shows familiarity with the various articles on Suetonius, but in spite of the wealth of critical material at his disposal, the number of significant changes from the text of Roth is inconsiderable, many though not all of them showing a return to the readings of the archetype, even to the extent of introducing new difficulties and new lacunae in place of the conjectures or readings of inferior MSS adopted, often with considerable probability in their favor, by Roth.

In deference to the authority of archetype, inscriptions, or equally satisfactory evidence, some familiar names have disappeared; e.g., Iul. 25 *Gebenna* has given place to *Cebenna*; Tib. 65 villa *Iovis* to villa *Ionis*; Claud. 2 *Iulio Antonio* to *Iullo Antonio*; Nero 34 L. *Agerinum* to L. *Agermum*; Nero 50 *Ecloge* to *Egloge*, and everywhere *Aenobarbus* to *Ahenobarbus*, *Thrax* to *Thraex*, *Catthi* to *Chatti*, *Virgilius* to *Vergilius*, etc. On the same basis a reasonable uniformity of spelling has been adopted and forms probably used by Suetonius have been restored in opposition to the consensus of MSS reading or in spite of orthographical vagaries. Thus *incoho* is everywhere read on the authority of Diomedes in place of *inchoo*, *cena* is everywhere substituted for *caena*, *-tt-* is read in the perfects *rettuli*, *attuli*, etc. The editor has possibly erred in not adopting what seems to have been a practice of Suetonius, in imitation of Varro, of writing *Hrodus*, *Hrianus*, *hrinoce-ros*, since he is evidently convinced that they were so written by the author. The courage which leads an editor to write *Ptolemaeus* seven times in the face of an unvarying MSS tradition in favor of *Ptolomaeus*, to write *Sameramin* on the authority of a Sardinian inscription and of the Memmianus in which the form has been corrected by the second hand, and to assume that Suetonius invariably wrote the genitive of

proper nouns in *-ius* with a single *i*, in the face of the doubts that are even now being expressed as to Cicero's unvarying adherence to this form, might well have carried him through this minor difficulty.

Ihm has returned to the reading of the archetype in a number of cases in which the sense of the passage is either absolutely unaffected or only an insignificant change is introduced; e. g., Iul. 50, and in seven other places the form *sestertium* with numeral adverbs has been restored for conjectured *sestertii* or *sestertio*, Iul. 55 *oratorem quem* takes the place of the conjecture *oratorum quem*, Nero 22 *prasini* takes the place of *prasinum*, etc., but he has also repeatedly adopted conjectures or the readings of late MSS where at least a word can be said in favor of the older tradition, e. g., Aug. *eriperet* of the archetype is certainly possible, Tib. 27 *auctore eo senatum se audisse* is not an impossible reading, Tib. 59 *remedium* as a genitive plural occurs also in Apuleius, iota for epsilon iota in Greek words seems to be justified in Claud. 40, Dom. 10, etc., by the Graeco-Roman pun *arci* in Dom. 13 which is said in the text to be Greek, though no editor has ever paid any attention to the statement by writing it in Greek letters.

In considerably more than a hundred passages the readings of late MSS are still retained, often where no name of a fifteenth-century scholar can be cited as the author of the happy conjecture, although we are told that the fifteenth-century MSS are worthless, and if anyone ventures to call attention to the fact that of necessity many of the readings of these MSS must be adopted in any edition of Suetonius, he is assumed to mean that the fifteenth-century MSS are superior to the Memmianus.

The general appearance of the book is marred by the insertion in the text of various brackets and devices to indicate *omittenda*, *supplenda*, *lacunae*, and hopelessly corrupt passages. After once stating that he has everywhere adopted the single *i* in the genitive of proper nouns in *-ius*, the editor should not print in the text fifty or more instances of the double letter with the second *i* in brackets, nor indicate the insertion of a second *t* in *rettulit* and of an *h* in *Ahenobarbus* by another form of bracket after informing us that he has everywhere inserted those letters. Above all these indications of "*supplenda*" should not be extended to include references to modern books as though they had ever formed a part of the archetype. Many such references are to some collection of fragments, e. g., Baehrens *Fragmenta Poetarum Romanorum*, and lead only to the information that the fragment in question is due to the passage in Suetonius from which one has just turned.

The portraits of the different emperors at the beginning and end of the separate lives are but indifferently executed; the facsimiles of the Memmianus and of the Gudianus at the end of the volume are excellently done.

ALBERT A. HOWARD

HARVARD UNIVERSITY